(MR. SPEAKER.)

as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now clauses. Clause 2. There is an amendment in the name of Sri Rama Rao.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—The amendment of which I have given notice was referred to by Sri Pattabhiraman. I am moving this amendment to clause (2). The amendment is:

"that the existing explanation be numbered as (1) and the following added as Explanation 2.

"*Explanation 2.*—

"Wagering shall also be deemed to include a competition of transaction in which prizes are offered for forecasts of the results either of a future event or of an event the result of which is not yet ascertained or generally known."

Sir, in moving this amendment and offering it for the acceptance of the House, all that I should like to add to what I have already said is that this particular explanation instead of restricting and limiting the meaning of the expression "gaming" as was suggested and asserted by Sri Pattabhiraman and by the Home Minister, respectively, clearly specifies "Satta" while it does not take away anything from the scope of what is covered by Explanation 1. The mere fact that these words which were originally contained in sub-clause (ii) of clause (*e*) are to be omitted is not going to improve the position because unless the omission there by the deletion of sub-clause (iii) is compensated by the inclusion of this clause in the appropriate place where it should properly belong, we will not have completed the process of amendment which we all have in mind in common. I must say that the deletion of sub-clause (ii) of clause (*e*) which contains the words which I seek to put as Explanation 2, makes so much difference to the definition of 'prize competition' contained in clause (*e*), that it makes a very serious departure . . . .

12-30 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now it is 12-30 P.M. The discussion on matters of public importance arising out of answers to questions will be taken up. One is by Sri B. Hutche Gowda to raise discussion in respect of question No. 86, 3rd set.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—He has not come. But I have signed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have only supported it. Next subject is to raise discussion in respect of Question No. 52 regarding extension granted to the Labour Commissioner by Sri R. K. Prasad.

DISCUSSIONS ON QUESTIONS.

Question No. 52: Regarding Extension granted to Labour Commissioner.

* Sri R. K. PRASAD (Bangarpet).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am much obliged to you for having given me an occasion to raise discussion on question No. 52. At the very outset, I would like to draw the Government's attention to the Chief Minister's assurance on the floor of this Assembly that extensions will not be given in the normal course of events. So, it is the duty of the Government to explain to this House under what extraordinary circumstances they gave extension to this Labour Commissioner. The post of Chief Inspector of Factories is clubbed along with the Labour Commissioner. I had put the question about his qualifications and the Government have been pleased to answer that the question is vague. What I wanted to know was being the Chief Inspector of

Factories, he has certain obligations to discharge to the workers, how far this gentleman was particularly qualified for that post. Secondly, Sir, the present Labour Commissioner held the post of Public Service Commissioner in the beginning and then the post of Law Secretary and now he is the Labour Commissioner. He is in the Labour Department for hardly two years. The Government must explain how in the interest of public service, his extension was absolutely essential. Then, Sir, recently he has issued a statement that Bhadravati dispute has been more or less amicably settled and there are only a very few points that have to be settled by the Minister. But the Labour Commissioner, I was told, has only settled minor things and all the major points are yet to be decided by the Minister. So, what I want to point out by this is that he is not fully conversant and competent with the Labour Act. Then, Sir, the Labour Unions have been repeatedly requesting the Labour Commissioner to implement the provisions for overtime wages, canteens, holidays, etc., and welfare measures which he has not been able to do even in big factories like Binny Mills and other factories. Then with regard to the Flour and Rice Mills, Sir, I have been informed that licences are pending for the last so many years in his office and I also learn that the Hon'ble Minister for Law inspected his Office recently—I do not know whether he went there to find out these things or whether he inspected this particular point or not. Also Sir, I do not know whether the Government are aware that there is a very keen agitation from labour and Labour Unions for his removal. Still the Government have been pleased to give extension to him. Whether this is done in the interest of public service, I would like to know. That is also one of the considerations. Then there is the question about travelling allowance drawn and other things and whether any gazetted or non-gazetted officers accompanied him from the headquarters on his tour and if so, how many times. I have asked that question and I have asked to furnish particulars monthwise and I have also asked for the amount of travelling allowance that he has drawn to be furnished monthwise. The answer that has been furnished is: Occasionally certain officials accompany him and generally he and his Daffedar and only a personal clerk go with him.' In the answers furnished, Sir, the Labour Commissioner has given information monthwise of his T.A. but about his other assistants that he has taken with him, he has given the dates of claim. Is this answer meant to mislead the Member or to mislead the Government? Whatever it is, the Government must be able to explain, Sir, because I would have been able to prove that it is not occasionally that he takes them, but that it is usually that he takes 4 or 5 officials with him invariably.

When I have asked for information on a specific point I do not understand why Government should give information as to the date of claim. This point I am raising to show that invariably the officials lead the Minister and the Members of the House in a wrong path. With these few remarks, I close my speech.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—I am glad I have this opportunity of explaining the position first regarding the combination of the Office of the Labour Commissioner with that of the Chief Inspector of Factories. The two are now at any rate different; they are being filled by different persons and the Labour Commissioner is not *ex-officio* Chief Inspector of Factories and that is why in the reply it is stated that no technical qualification is necessary.

Regarding the extension of service, I am very glad to say that the Central Government not only at the time of the Conference but also when they went over here, and visited the office, appreciated his work. The opinion

(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.)

of the Centre, so far as I can gather, as also the opinion of all Labour Commissioners coming from different Provinces, is one of deep approval and also encomium. Further, the Labour Commissioner, has rich and varied experience not only in one Department but also in several other Departments and the labour generally are satisfied. The statement that there is an agitation for retiring that gentleman is not true, and so far we have not received any communication from any Labour Union as to bad conduct or anything like that regarding the Labour Commissioner. It was felt necessary that the labour work which he has been doing so efficiently, which has been appreciated by the Centre and by several officers visiting from U.S.A. required an extension of his services.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—What was the test you applied for the efficiency ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The general satisfaction felt by the several Labour Unions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No questions by any other Member. No other Member has sought permission.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—As I submitted, several Labour officers visiting from U.S.A. went round and also saw the work in various factories. They have said that in some respects it is on a par with the conditions available in America and in some respects the advancement is even better. That position the Government also have to appreciate.

Lastly reference was made to the pendency of licenses in this Office. Visiting the Office, I saw the figures also. The work has increased by four-fold, whereas the quantum of staff has remained stationary. So there is some delay. It is not the fault of the Commissioner, but for want of sufficient staff there is some delay and the Department has tried to secure more staff. It is regretted and it has got to be remedied. The remedy does not lie in the immediate retirement of the Labour Commissioner but in providing additional staff. Under these circumstances, I feel that the extension of service granted to this able and experienced Commissioner was fully justified.

Sri R. K. PRASAD.—He did not meet my point of giving these misleading answers. The date of claim is given when I have....

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have sought for information as to the amount of travelling allowance drawn monthwise so far as the Commissioner is concerned ; you have sought for the date of claim regarding officials. You see pages 14 and 15. Anyhow, you have made a statement. The Minister has made a brief statement. That is what the rule says.

MYSORE POLICE (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953.

Consideration of Clauses— (continued).

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—Before the House rises, I have got a statement to make. Anyhow, as ordinary men we have no control over events that happen. I was very particular.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is very obvious to-day. (*Laughter*).

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I think the Bill may be passed to-day. It is for this reason. I do not want to aim at any stifling of discussion. You are there to guide us. I was very particular that this Bill might be passed during the course of this session. There is the other House also. The other House is scheduled to close its sittings tomorrow only. May I therefore humbly make a suggestion whether it would be possible for the House to reassemble once again in the course of this day and consider the Bill ? Probably if we